

Vol. IV

No. 1

The Art Bulletin

AN ILLUSTRATED QUARTERLY PUBLISHED BY THE

College Art Association Of America

Editor

JOHN SHAPLEY

Editorial Board

DAVID M. ROBINSON, *Chairman*

ALFRED M. BROOKS

JOHN PICKARD

ARTHUR W. DOW

ARTHUR K. PORTER

FRANK J. MATHER

PAUL J. SACHS

SEPTEMBER

NINETEEN HUNDRED TWENTY-ONE

One dollar a copy

Three dollars a volume

BROWN UNIVERSITY, PROVIDENCE

The Art Bulletin

*An illustrated quarterly published by the
COLLEGE ART ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA*

Members of the College Art Association receive The Art Bulletin.
Life membership is open to all; the fee is one hundred dollars.

Sustaining membership is open to all; the annual fee is ten dollars.

Associate membership, or subscription to The Art Bulletin, is open to all;
the annual fee is three dollars.

Active membership is open to those engaged in art education; the annual
fee is five dollars.

The College Art Association year extends from May to May. All sub-
scriptions to The Art Bulletin begin with the first number of the current
volume.

Address all communications to

JOHN SHAPLEY, SECRETARY,
COLLEGE ART ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA,
BROWN UNIVERSITY, PROVIDENCE.

STATEMENT OF THE OWNERSHIP, MANAGEMENT, CIRCULATION, ETC
REQUIRED BY THE ACT OF CONGRESS OF AUGUST 24, 1912.

Of The Art Bulletin, published quarterly, at Providence, Rhode Island, for April 1, 1921.
State of Rhode Island, County of Providence.

Before me, a notary public in and for the State and county aforesaid, personally appeared John Shapley, who, having been duly sworn according to law, deposes and says that he is the Managing Editor of The Art Bulletin, and that the following is, to the best of his knowledge and belief, a true statement of the ownership, management, etc., of the aforesaid publication for the date shown in the above caption, required by the Act of August 24, 1912, embodied in section 443, Postal Laws and Regulations, to wit:

1. That the names and addresses of the publisher, editor, managing editor, and business managers are: Publisher, College Art Association of America, Brown University, Providence; Editor-in-Chief, David M. Robinson, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore; Managing Editor, John Shapley, Brown University, Providence; Business Managers, None.
2. That the owners are: College Art Association of America, Brown University, Providence.
3. That the known bondholders, mortgagees, and other security holders owning or holding 1 per cent or more of total amount of bonds, mortgages, or other securities are: None.
4. That the two paragraphs next above, giving the names of the owners, stockholders, and security holders, if any, contain not only the list of stockholders and security holders as they appear upon the books of the company but also, in cases where the stockholder or security holder appears upon the books of the company as trustee or in any other fiduciary relation, the name of the person or corporation for whom such trustee is acting, is given; also that the said two paragraphs contain statements embracing affiant's full knowledge and belief as to the circumstances and conditions under which stockholders and security holders who do not appear upon the books of the company as trustees, hold stock and securities in a capacity other than that of a bona fide owner; and this affiant has no reason to believe that any other person, association, or corporation has any interest direct or indirect in the said stock, bonds, or other securities than as so stated by him.

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 31st day of March, 1921

John Shapley

[Seal]

F. T. Guild, Notary Public
(My commission expires June 30 1923)

CONTENTS

| | Page |
|--|------|
| THE AGE OF THE EXTANT COLUMNS OF THE OLYMPIEUM AT ATHENS, by A. D. FRASER | 5 |
| A NOTE TO PURGATORIO X, 55-63, by JOHN SHAPLEY..... | 19 |
| THE PAGEANT IN COLLEGES AND ART SCHOOLS, by HOWARD FREMONT STRATTON | 27 |
| REVIEWS..... | 31 |
| NOTES..... | 39 |

The Age of the Extant Columns of the Olympieum at Athens¹

By A. D. FRASER

NO great building of antiquity has possessed a more curious history than has the temple of Olympian Zeus at Athens—curious, that is, in so far as its history has been preserved to the modern world; for this magnificent monument has been surrounded, as it were, with a cloud of obscurity and almost mystery alike in its time of construction and in that of its decay. Projected and begun in the sixth century before Christ, the temple witnessed the rolling by of more than six hundred years before it finally reached completion, at a time when the true glories of Greece had long since fallen in the dust.

Meagre as is the light thrown upon the history of the Olympieum from literary sources, we are nevertheless able to discern the following facts. The idea of paying honor to the king of gods and men by the erection of a temple to his divinity at Athens was conceived in the mind of the despot Peisistratus, who, after selecting a suitable site on the banks of the Ilissus, laid the foundations in about the year 530 B. C. The work progressed and, if we are to put faith in the observation of a late writer,² the structure was half-finished when, twenty years later, Athens asserted her freedom and rid herself of the obnoxious family of tyrants. Whatever the state of its advancement may have been, we are justified in the belief that the Athenians took but little pride in this adornment of their city. Why, otherwise,

¹This article is an epitome of a paper recently read before the Archaeological Seminary of the Johns Hopkins University. I am indebted to the director of the seminary, Professor David M. Robinson, for valuable assistance and suggestions. I wish also to thank Professor W. B. Dinsmoor of Columbia University for information regarding a supposed Olympieum capital.

²*Geog. Græci Min.* 1, 97 sq.

would the literary men refer to it only by way of a landmark, and that too but seldom? It is impossible in this respect to disregard the judgment of the philosopher Aristotle,¹ who compares the erection of this sanctuary with the construction of the pyramids of Egypt and the great public works of the despots of Samos and Corinth, and stigmatizes the whole as characteristic of the most odious feature of tyranny, the drugging, as it were, of the human mind, so as to leave no opportunity for revolutionary schemes.

For three centuries and more the unfinished temple lay neglected and by the end of this period had in all probability fallen into a state of decay. Public spirit at Athens was virtually dead, and a few more generations might well have seen the obliteration of the very site of the sanctuary, when a new builder appeared on the scene. The great Hellenizing monarch of the east, Antiochus Epiphanes, the Seleucid King of Syria, after ruthlessly doing violence to the worship of Jehovah at Jerusalem, came to Athens with a proposal to revive the cult of Zeus. But the Athenians had no temple to this deity other than the crumbling ruin on the banks of the Ilissus. Antiochus, therefore, having infinite resources at his command, proceeded to restore, or rather to rebuild, the temple. It is characteristic of this fanatical and eccentric monarch that, while retaining the original site, he went to extreme pains in altering the orientation of the building, so as to make it face as nearly due east as was possible with the engineering instruments of his time. This fact has been revealed to us by archæologists, not by the Greek or Roman writers. Needless to say, attention to the carrying out of this mystical detail very considerably enhanced the pretentious nature of the undertaking, and the death of Epiphanes in 164 once more occasioned the abandoning of the work, again, if we are to believe Strabo, in a "half finished" condition.

The century succeeding this abortive attempt is a period of darkness in respect to the Olympieum's history. It is recorded, however, by Pliny the Elder that Sulla filched certain of the columns of the Athenian temple and later employed them in the building of his sanctuary to Jupiter

¹ *Polit.* 5, 11, 8.

Capitolinus at Rome.¹ According to the various theories of modern scholars, these may have been discarded pillars dating from the time of Peisistratus; or they may have been relatively small columns from the cella of Antiochus' temple; or the whole may be a pure fabrication, based on a consideration of the well-known propensities of Sulla. The truth will probably never be known. Again, several decades later, in the age of Augustus, as Suetonius records,² a scheme was set on foot for the completion of the Olympieum by certain dignitaries who were allied with Rome. But if any work of construction was actually begun, as seems most unlikely, it must have been almost immediately relinquished; otherwise we should undoubtedly have some notice of the matter from the contemporary panegyrists of the emperor, nor would the *Monumentum Ancyranum* be silent.

Another century rolled by, and the Olympieum was at last finished and dedicated by that distinguished friend of Greek culture, the emperor Hadrian. He who labored so tirelessly for the revival and propagation of Hellenic art and learning was not likely to slight the "eye of Greece." Athens was enriched under Hadrian's rule with a goodly number of monuments of art, and the temple of Olympian Zeus, which had lain unfinished for twenty long generations, at last saw its completion in or about the year 131 A. D. It was of little import that Hadrian now began to identify himself with Zeus and to assume the title *Olympius*, that an altar and a symbol of his divinity were consecrated to him in the temple, and that he demanded sacrifices and other divine honors from the priests. The "*Götterdämmerung*" of the Olympian deities had already come. Zeus or Hadrian—it mattered little. As for the Olympieum itself, its construction must have always been associated in the mind of the Athenian with the name of despot, foreign adventurer, plunderer, and overlord.

There follows a gap in our history of fully 1300 years. What happened to the Olympieum in the meantime we can only conjecture. It appears probable that decay set in early and was rapid, though there is no evidence in the sur-

¹N. H. 36, 5, 45.

²Aug. 60.

viving remains for a catastrophe such as wrought havoc with the beauties of the Parthenon. As the building disintegrated, a small church was built among the ruins largely out of the material of the temple itself. But no written word concerning the Olympieum has come down to us till we reach the fifteenth century of our era. The great explorer and traveller, Cyriac of Ancona, rediscovered the temple in the year 1436. The ravages of time and of humanity were at that date very manifest; for of the total of 104 main columns of the temple, only "about 21" were found standing. Thereafter we have a more or less continuous series of references to the temple (usually wrongly identified, however), from the successive visits of travellers to the city. Within the course of the two centuries following Cyriac, some four of the columns disappeared, but a total of seventeen survived till after the middle of the eighteenth century, when one was destroyed by a Turkish governor. Finally, a great storm and earthquake in 1852 resulted in the overthrow of still another of these massive pillars. Today this fallen monarch and fifteen standing companions survive; little change has taken place in the ruins during the last three centuries. This noteworthy preservation of the temple—and that, too, mainly under Turkish rule—seems to be accounted for in part if not wholly by the superstitious beliefs that have long been associated popularly with the shrine. Voices of lamentation have been heard from the ruins, and at night black spirits have been seen to leap from column to column, as though the ghosts of the long dead Peisistratus, Antiochus, and Hadrian were striving to preserve their sanctuary!

The temple of the Olympian Zeus, as it stood completed in the second century of our era, might well have ranked with the seven wonders of the ancient world and merited the judgment of Livy, "*templum . . . unum in terris inchoatum pro magnitudine dei*,"¹ expressed, moreover, a century earlier, when it was far from completion. Pausanias puts the peribolos of the temple at a length of four stades,² and measurements of the great stone platform on which the

¹41, 20, 8.

²1, 18, 6-8.

building stands show that his estimate is not far from being exact. The fifteen columns which still stand (Fig. 1) are approximately of a height of 56 feet, 6 inches, while the extreme height of the building must have been more than 90 feet. The temple was octostyle (not decastyle, as was long supposed), having eight columns on the ends; its extreme length and breadth were 354 and 135 feet respectively. The structure, furthermore, was dipteral, with a double row of columns surrounding the cella, 20 on either side. It is impossible here to enter into the disputed question as to whether the temple was hypæthral, having the naos wholly or partially open to the sky. The architectural order employed was the Corinthian, the sole example of the Corinthian to be found in a sacred building in the city of Athens.

The first attempt at securing measurements of the ruined temple was made by the traveller Francis Vernon in 1676, but no detailed description of the building was published till the appearance of one in the monumental work of Stuart and Revett, *The Antiquities of Athens* (Vol. III), in 1794, and again, in the enlarged and improved edition of 1827. Scientific methods were first applied to the study of the remains by the architect Penrose, who in 1851 and again in 1888 brought out his *Principles of Athenian Architecture*. A comprehensive essay dealing with the Olympieum was written in 1883 by Professor Louis Bevier (*Papers Am. School of Class. Stud. at Athens*, Vol. 1), who was at that time a student in Greece. The building has, however, been notably neglected by archaeologists. Penrose and others carried out some minor excavations among the ruins, but there is still here untouched what will constitute at some time a fruitful field for future investigators.

In view of what we may term the composite authorship of the Olympieum, the question has often been raised: who erected the sixteen columns that we have today? Of course, Peisistratus, though undoubtedly some of his work survives in the foundation of the building, must be ruled out of court entirely. It has been determined, as noted above, that the temple received a new orientation at the hands of Antiochus, and, moreover, the Corinthian order of archi-

tecture is not so old as the *tyrannus*. Was the builder, then, Antiochus or Hadrian or, conceivably, Augustus? The thing was questioned as long ago as 1827, when the second edition of the *Antiquities of Athens* appeared, and has never been fully and satisfactorily dealt with. Penrose was apparently the first to face the problem frankly; in his edition of 1851 he hazarded the guess, presumably voicing contemporary opinion, that the work was done under Augustus. The sole basis for this unfortunate conjecture lay in some superficial resemblances between the workmanship of the Olympieum and that of one or more Augustan buildings. But Penrose had too much intellectual honesty to maintain for long such a view; so, in his later edition, we find him formally recanting and declaring in favor of Epiphanes. This judgment is founded upon certain architectural and stylistic principles which the author outlines, and his theory has been followed by such scholars as Ernest Gardner, Weller, Bevier, Spiers, and J. G. Frazer. In opposition are the architects Sturgis and Durm and others, who "on the whole" are inclined to favor the theory of a Hadrianic origin. Credit must, however, be given to Penrose for presenting a carefully reasoned brief for his side of the case. The opponents of his view content themselves, for the most part, with either a dogmatic assertion or else with the *a priori* argument that Hadrian is nearer to us in point of time and had the last hand in the construction of the temple, therefore, in all probability he erected the part which survives. Any such contention, while specious, can hardly be accepted without the addition of more definite grounds for belief.

It is clearly demonstrable that the columns of the Olympieum which we see in Athens today were constructed under the supervision of either Epiphanes or Hadrian, monarchs who were separated one from the other by a period of three centuries. Let us review for a moment the position of each in the ancient world and the type of art which he cultivated. The Syrian king, fanatical though he may have been, had nevertheless a definite goal in view throughout his twelve-year regime. His aim was the Hellenizing of Asia, just as in the West the Romans were Latinizing Italy; and it was with

PLATE I



FIG. 1—ATHENS, OLYMPIEUM



FIG. 2—ATHENS, OLYMPIEUM: CAPITAL



a view to this that his energies were so ruthlessly exerted in Palestine towards the crushing out of Judaism. But Athens was still one of the great sources of Hellenic culture, and Antiochus found it to his interest to pay court to the Athenians. For him Grecian culture was consummated in the Olympian Zeus, so it is no great wonder that we find him, on his arrival at Athens, undertaking to build again the sanctuary of Zeus that had fallen down. Curiously enough, his architect was not a Greek but a Roman, but there can be little doubt that the artistic principles manifested in the new edifice were those favored by Epiphanes himself. They may have possessed more than a suggestion of Oriental color and richness, but they must certainly have embodied the best and finest ideals of the later Hellenistic period.

Nor was Hadrian any less a Greek in spirit. "He was so thoroughly familiar with Greek literature," writes an ancient biographer, "that he was called 'the little Greek.' He had completely adopted the studies, the manner of life, the language, and the whole culture of the Athenians."¹ And as Gregorovius, his modern biographer, remarks: "The renaissance of the antique is one of the most marked features of Hadrian's mind . . . If he failed in his attempt to revive the arts, the fault lay in the times, not in himself."² It is therefore no surprise to find that the art—and perhaps in particular the architectural art—of the time of Hadrian, and indeed of the second century after Christ in general, is based on ancient models more closely than is even that of the age of Augustus. Hence, we may expect to find the types of art which flourished under Hadrian and under Antiochus far from unlike in many important characteristics. This circumstance more than any other has, I think, thrown a stumbling-block in the way of those who have attempted to reach a successful conclusion as to the dating of the Olympieum. The point is one of extreme importance and can never be safely overlooked in a discussion of this problematical affair.

¹Aurelius Victor, *Epitome* 14.

²*Life of Hadrian*, p. 333.

In our examination of the question it will be found convenient to revert to the work of Penrose, on whose authority the extant temple has so often been assigned to the age of Antiochus, and to review briefly the arguments upon which his claim is based. Four features of the columns are cited by him as determinants: (1) the general workmanship; (2) the character of the entasis; (3) the form of the abacus; (4) the type of acanthus leaf on the capital. Let us examine these in order (*Cf. Fig. 2*).

The nature of the workmanship, says Penrose, is that of the Hellenistic period rather than that of late Roman work. The statement is obviously a very indefinite one, as its author would doubtless have acknowledged. Furthermore, there is a marked difference between the workmanship which we find on the buildings of Hadrian and on the rapidly degenerating monuments of the third and fourth centuries of our era which Penrose seems to have had in mind. On the other hand, there is, as we have indicated above, a striking resemblance between Hadrianic art and that of Hellenistic and even earlier times.

The entasis of the columns is acknowledged by the architect to be of a character inferior to that manifested in the great works of art on the Acropolis, but it is said to avoid the tendency to extreme exaggeration which occurs in late Roman temples. This argument, however, is weak; Penrose must have been thinking of the ugly "bulgy" column which is to be associated with the period of extreme decadence in Roman architectural art, and which was quite foreign to the best efforts of the second century A. D.

The third argument of Penrose appears on the face of it to be more weighty. His contention is that in the older temples of the Corinthian order the curves of the abacus were so arranged as to avoid the extreme elongation of the corner angles which is to be observed on the abaci of the majority of Roman buildings. It must be confessed that many of the temples erected by Hadrian and his successors do present this feature. But, on the other hand, Penrose failed to note that the lines of the abacus of the arch of Hadrian which stands almost within the shadow of the Olympieum are almost identical with those of the temple;

nor is there any marked dissimilarity of form in the abacus of the library of Hadrian on the farther side of the Acropolis. Of still greater importance is the fact that the temple of Apollo at Miletus,¹ which is much earlier than the time of Antiochus, bears an abacus with considerably sharper corner-angles than those of the Olympieum. It follows that the "sharp-angle" was no invention of the Romans; the form of abacus cannot be looked upon as a definitely determining factor in a discussion of this kind.

The question of the form of acanthus leaf which we see on the capitals of the temple of Olympian Zeus is an extremely important one, and it involves a study of the subject which can at best be only summarized here. If we leave out of consideration the monument of Lysicrates, whose capitals bear a unique type of foliage, we are justified, I think, in the assertion that the leafage of all purely Greek Corinthian capitals is essentially of a single type. There are minor variations, to be sure, but there are no great divergences from the orthodox form, which to me, at least, seems to be a conventionalized imitation of the leaf of the *acanthus mollis* of nature. In Roman architecture, however, the case is altogether different. A wide latitude was allowed the sculptor, who not infrequently wandered far afield and produced such types as the "herb-leaf" which we see on the temple of Vesta at Tivoli,² and the "fine-serrate," appearing, for example, on the triumphal arches³ of Severus, Constantine, and Sergius. To what we may term the stereotyped Roman form there has been applied the name "olive-leaved" acanthus, a style which is seen at its best in the luxuriant and graceful foliage on the temple of Mars Ultor,⁴ a very characteristic form of the Augustan age. Manifestly, the leaf has been imitated from Greek originals, probably Alexandrian, but one is strongly reminded of the drooping and florid foliage of the tropics. In the second century, however, the details were radically altered; an element of reserve and austerity was introduced; the leaf,

¹Cf. Von Soldern, *Architekt. Formenl.*, p. 116.

²Uhde, *The Architectural Forms of the Classic Ages*, pl. 44.

³Ibid., pl. 54, figs. 1, 2, 3.

⁴Ibid., pl. 38, fig. 2.

in short, became simplified and conventionalized, and there was a definite reversion to classical models. Hadrian, of course, led the way, and quite obviously fashioned his leaf after the pattern of the Greek original.

What is perhaps the strongest point in the argument of Penrose is his comparison of the acanthus foliage of the Olympieum with that of the Tholos of Epidaurus (Fig. 3), built in the fourth century, B. C. It cannot be denied that the resemblance is strikingly close. In either case the body of the leaf lies close to the bell of the capital and is of a severe and subdued style, of stiff and clear-cut outline. But a feature which would tend to militate in the opposite direction is the downward-turned tips of the leaves, something which is characteristic of the leaf of the second century A. D. and indeed of Roman work in general (*Cf.* Fig. 5). If, furthermore, the capital be compared as closely with typical work of the age of Hadrian as with the older monuments, the striking resemblances of the two become at once at least equally patent. One has but to compare the capitals of Hadrian's monuments in Athens herself—such as the arch (Fig. 5), the library, and the capital in the National Museum which belongs to a Hadrianic building to the north-west of the Acropolis¹—to see the truth of this. The crux of the matter lies in the fact that Hadrian consciously imitated the style of foliage of the period to which the Tholos belongs.

Up to this point the weights in the scales seem to balance pretty evenly; but three other possible determinants have not yet been thrown into the pan. These were not cited by Penrose nor, as far as I am aware, by any other scholar, but the importance of at least one of them seems altogether preëminent. Let us consider (1) the amount of ornamentation, consisting of leafage and scrolls or volutes, relative to the entire surface area of the capital; (2) the position of the middle volutes; (3) the acanthus bloom on the side of the capital.

¹This capital (No. 1496, Nat. Mus.), which was discovered near the Hephaestum in 1891, was originally thought to have belonged to the Olympieum (*Cf.* Anderson and Spiers, *Archit. of Greece and Rome*, 1902, fig. 72). This view is now untenable, but the capital doubtless has come from one of Hadrian's buildings which are known to have been erected in this neighborhood.

PLATE II



FIG. 3—EPIDAURUS,
THOLOS: CAPITAL



FIG. 4—ROME, VILLA MEDICI:
CAPITAL FROM THE ARA PACIS



FIG. 5—ATHENS, ARCH OF HADRIAN:
CAPITAL



Generally speaking, there is a reasonably definite distinction to be drawn in this respect between the Greek and Roman capital. The former is as a rule only partially covered with decoration, while the Romans preferred to mask almost entirely the face of the bell. It is to be observed that the capital of the Olympieum conforms to the latter type rather than to the former; the bell is obscured to a much greater degree than in the case of the Tholos capital, or, in fact, any of the orthodox Greek type.

The degree of elaboration or ornamentation to be discerned on the volutes is a matter of no consequence from our point of view, as some archaic buildings possess them in a highly ornate form, while on certain late Roman works we find them severely plain; but the position of the middle volutes with reference to each other is a matter of moment. It is to my mind very suggestive that in most, if not all, Greek buildings, where the middle volutes are present and are, as is regularly the case, placed so as to confront each other as on the Olympieum capital, they are brought into actual contact one with the other. But here they are separated by a space of several inches (*Cf.* Figs. 3 and 2). This, as will be shown a little later, is a marked characteristic of the capital of the second century of our era.

One of the crowning beauties of the Corinthian capital is found in the acanthus bloom, or the occasional palmette, which stands on the face of the bell or on the side of the abacus, above the middle volutes. It varies greatly both as to form and as to position, though on Roman buildings we usually find it elevated to the side of the abacus. The Roman flower, likewise, as a rule received a greater degree of elaboration than its Greek prototype, although there are notable exceptions. Something, however, which is of the greatest importance is to be observed in the case of the acanthus bloom of the Olympieum. It is supported in its position, as it were, by a long graceful stem which passes between the two middle scrolls and takes its origin among the leaves beneath. It seems altogether surprising that so acute an observer as Penrose was not struck by the significance of this artistic motive. In a comparison of this capital with that of the Tholos, it is evident that an entirely fresh detail

has here been added; the flower of the Tholos capital appears as attached directly to the side of the bell.

A careful study of the acanthus bloom as we find it on the Corinthian capital during the long period stretching from the fourth century B. C. to the third century A. D. reveals some startling facts. In the first place, so far as I have been able to find, the flower stalk *motif* is altogether unknown in Greek art, if we except the possibility of the Olympieum being a Greek ruin. In the Roman age, its first appearance that I can discover is on the engaged capitals of the Ara Pacis of Augustus (Fig. 4), a monument which, it may be observed, is frequently appraised by critics as being Greek in general conception, Italian in its details. The stem also appears on the great temple at Pola¹ in Istria, which is of about the same date, and there is a very rudimentary flower stalk to be seen on the capitals of the temple of Mars Ultor. A very few other examples occur in the second half of the first century A. D., as on a pilaster from the Roman theatre at Ephesus and on the capitals of the temple of Isis at Pompeii.² But in all these instances there appears a hesitation, as it were, on the part of the artist against letting the flower stalk be fully seen. It is of a rudimentary and undeveloped form, and is partially hidden behind the middle volutes, which still come into contact as on Greek capitals. But—and here we have something of paramount importance—in the second century this feature of the parted scrolls and conspicuous flower stalk springs into sudden popularity. It takes precisely the form in which we have it on the Olympieum, and it appears, *e. g.*, on the monument of Philopappus, built at Athens in the time of Trajan, fifteen years before the completion of the Olympieum; the temple of Antonine and Faustina, finished ten years after our temple; the temple at Dugga in Tunis, 166-169; the temple of Vesta at Rome, finally restored in 191. Of still greater moment is the fact that this *motif* is found to constitute what may almost be termed the trade-mark of Hadrian's work. Thus, we see it on the capitals of both the library and the arch of Had-

¹Sturgis, *Hist. of Architecture*, Vol. 1, p. 354.

²Uhde, *op. cit.*, pl. 40, fig. 10.

rian (Fig. 5) at Athens, as well as on the museum capital already mentioned as belonging to a Hadrianic building.¹ It is also present on the following works which were either built or restored by Hadrian: the propylaea at Eleusis, the Pantheon, the temple of Neptune, the Basilica Aemilia, the temple of Castor, the temple to the Genius of Rome at Ephesus, and others.

The case may now be thus briefly summarized. In our re-examination of the argument of Penrose, it is revealed that the evidence for the Epiphanic authorship of the extant columns is much weaker than formerly supposed, and that the claim of Hadrian seems at least equally strong. But we later discover that in the flower stalk motive appearing on the Olympieum we have something which is essentially non-Greek, something indeed which does not appear to have had its origin till Roman imperial times. The device is at first used with hesitation and does not become fully developed till about the time of Hadrian. This emperor adopts it with enthusiasm, and it presently appears as almost a distinguishing feature of his work. The inference is obvious; there can be no room for reasonable doubt that we are indebted to Hadrian for the columns which survive.

It may perhaps be questioned whether it is safe to base this conclusion on what is after all little more than a single artistic detail. But I do not fear to do so; the history of the feature is too significant, and from the very nature of the case its introduction would be a late device. According to the tradition of the Greeks, the early architectural acanthus blooms were fashioned out of bronze, and the heart of the flower was represented by the head of the pin whereby they were attached to the capital. Thus, they would theoretically require no stem, and the invention of the latter would surely appear to have taken place at some late date when the tradition was forgotten or disregarded. Furthermore, the flower stalk is apparently unknown to Vitruvius, who fails to make mention of it in his detailed description of the Corinthian capital; and here the *argumen-*

¹Except that on this capital the middle volutes come into contact, as they occasionally do also on the library capitals.

THE COLLEGE ART ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA

18 THE COLLEGE ART ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA.

tum a silentio cannot be deemed worthless, for he specifically mentions the flower itself.

To Hadrian, then, we must assign the extant capitals, at least—in all probability, the entire columns as well. Just how far Antiochus went in his construction we shall probably never know.¹

¹This article had gone to the press before the appearance in America of E. Weigand's *Vorgeschichte des korinthischen Kapitells* (Würzburg, 1920). The writer has, therefore, been unable to utilize the material of this valuable work.



PLATE III



FIG. 1—FLORENCE, UFFIZI: ILLUSTRATION FOR PURGATORIO X (DETAIL),
BY FEDERICO ZUCCARO

A Note to *Purgatorio X*, 55-63

BY JOHN SHAPLEY

"Cut in the marble there the cart and oxen
were drawing up the holy Ark, which made
men dread a charge not given them in trust.
People in front appeared; and all of them,
forming seven choirs, made one of my two senses
say 'No,' and the other one say 'Yes, they sing.'
So, too, by reason of the incense-smoke,
which there was pictured forth, my eyes and nose
became discordant as to Yes and No."

—(*Langdon's translation*)

WITH these words Dante begins the description of the relief representing the procession of the ark (Fig. 1). What he says of this relief reveals an ever pertinent principle of criticism. Whether we have a relief, a painting, or a poem, the sense directly (immediately and primarily) stimulated is not the only one to be considered. There are always indirect (suggested and secondary) stimulations. Dante's eye saw accurately as far as visual images were concerned. The technique was clear to it: "*Cut in the marble there the cart and oxen were drawing up the holy Ark.*" It was not deceived as to the reality of the representation: "*People in front appeared (parea).*" But his visual impressions went further and caused his imagination to supply images in terms of the other senses. Although his ear said "No," his eyes said "Yes, they sing." Similarly, the evidence of his nose was contradicted by his eyes.

What is the reason for this contradiction of sense impressions which Dante experienced, why is such a complication of direct and indirect stimulations felt by the observer of a work of art? In any investigation of the effect of a work of art it is useful to inquire into the process which has previously taken place in the mind of the artist himself.

For the observer's reaction to a painting or a poem is closely akin to this process, so closely, in fact, as to lead some aestheticians to speak of his appreciation of the work of art as a creation, duplicating the original in the mind of the artist. To make our inquiry into the mental process of the artist more clear and at the same time more simple and personal, let us take as example our own attempts at framing perfect expressions of our ideas and imaginings. Such perfect expressions would be at least analogous to works of art if not always, as Croce maintains, actually such. Suppose I am trying to give verbal expression to a certain figurative idea which has presented itself to my mind, the idea of the life of the Early Christians as fixed in the mosaic surfaces of their walls (Fig. 2). Perhaps I am not able for the moment to perfect my verbal expression, I am not able to think of words to express that absolute annihilation of movement in ossification or petrification. But at the same time I complete the expression in my own mind with a perfectly clear *visual image*, which makes the idea wonderfully vivid to myself even though I am not able to express it verbally to another. I see that life, or, if you will, Empress Theodora, suddenly entrapped in the hardening plaster of the wall and held like a jewel, or (to keep to the terms of our picture) like the tesserae. To take a more familiar example—in describing an early spring morning I may have a much clearer inner idea than I am able to express in words, because in imagination all the senses are stimulated: I can see all the subtle harmonies of light in the sky, can hear the soft rustle of leaves and the clear call of birds, can feel the spongy texture of the ground and the dampness of the dewy leaves, can smell the sweetly blended odors of the flowers. Even though we may be formal disciples of the doctrine that to have a clear idea is to be able to express it, how often has every one of us called out in despair, "I have the idea, but I can't express it!" Recognition of such experiences as those just described justifies us in this spontaneous observation. Certainly, every form of outer expression is so conventional, so arbitrary, when compared to the elasticity and range of the imagination, with its free play in combining the data of the various

PLATE IV



FIG. 2—RAVENNA, SAN VITALE: EMPRESS THEODORA AND HER SUITE



FIG. 3—BERLIN, KAISER FRIEDRICH MUSEUM: ILLUSTRATION FOR INFERO XXXI, BY BOTTICELLI



senses, that it is impossible to identify outer expression with inner, or to affirm that every inner expression is capable of complete outer expression.

Now let us return to Dante before the relief representing the procession of the ark. Is it any wonder that the relief stimulated in him other senses along with that of sight? If the sculptor left these other senses out of consideration in his work, if he took no thought of their satisfaction, albeit indirect, in the relief, how could he approach any complete presentation of what he had in mind? The sculptor's task is not to avoid secondary stimulations but to suggest them in such a way that they do not distract. No doubt our usual reaction to a work of art differs somewhat from that described by Dante because, although subconsciously we know that the picture or the relief operates by suggestion, we are not ordinarily sufficiently introspective and sufficiently keen psychologically to give any attention to the matter. We do not stop to analyze and emphasize as Dante did. We do not think of our senses as contradicting each other; we allow them free play, delighting to live in the world of pure imagination just as did the artist before us.

This free interplay of the material of the various senses in the imagination of the artist, the almost, if not complete, impossibility of attending consistently to that of a single one and ignoring all else, ought to give us a more sympathetic appreciation of Wagner's theories than is customary on the part of the modern æsthetician. Further, it ought to abate the loud declaiming against descriptive music and poetry, against narrative painting and sculpture, and against the art of illustration in general.

It is precisely for the art of illustration that the passage of Dante quoted is significant. The lengthy descriptions of the reliefs in Purgatory are alone enough to prove the importance and vividness of his visual imagery. Elsewhere, even though Dante's visualization is not expressed by the out-and-out description of works of art, there can be no doubt that visual images corresponding to those drawn by Botticelli or the early miniaturists existed in the mind of the poet. The various illustrators differ among themselves in their reproduction of those visual images because the literary

form, perfected as it is by the master poet, has not been able to give them exact expression. The passage of Dante under discussion is enough to show how incorrect it is to assert without qualification that the subject-matter of one art is not suitable for another. One art will express a given subject more completely than another; but we may feel sure that there are always aspects of any extensive and complex subject, such as Dante's, which can be more definitely expressed by some art other than the one which expresses the whole most completely. It seems only reasonable, then, coming back to a previous point, that a more perfect expression of the artist's inner creation should be obtained by combining different arts, or by supplementing one dominant art with others. It may, indeed, be argued that in practice the use of different media diverts the attention and destroys the homogeneity of effect, but no mortal ever went through so long a poem as Dante's without having his attention distracted by things much less pertinent than accompanying illustration. Furthermore, the passage used as our text shows how desirous the poet was of introducing a diversion by carving a relief as well as he could with words.

Much of the prejudice against illustration has arisen through a misunderstanding of its fundamental nature. It is usually falsely conceived as being or attempting to be duplicative; as a matter of fact, it is essentially supplementary. Every work of art, as we have said, stimulates at least one sense directly, others it stimulates only indirectly. The purpose of illustration is to give direct stimulation to a sense which is but indirectly stimulated by the work illustrated. Dante's poem gives indirect stimulation to the visual sense; the visual images which he had he has only indirectly expressed. For illustrators, like William Blake or Botticelli, the problem has been to give direct expression to those visual images.

There are, however, many things not altogether visual which we are accustomed to take in through the eye. We constantly watch, for instance, expressions and gestures, attitudes and movements. Our ultimate perception of them is to be credited in the main to our muscular sense and

our sense of balance. Although illustration may well serve to render them, they are only a byproduct of it. They are the direct product of entirely different arts, the arts of dancing and acting. Other sense impressions, those of touch, smell, taste, temperature, pressure, weight, balance or direction, and pain, are given in illustration even more indirectly, chiefly by association with expression and gesture, attitude and movement.

Impressions of hearing occupy a unique position because of the well-nigh universal acceptation of the conventions of writing (letters, musical notations, punctuation marks), by which, when they are used in connection with illustration, auditory impressions are communicable no more indirectly than are the muscular ones above mentioned. But when, as is commonly the case (and some would not consider the other method true illustration), sound is expressed in illustration without writing, it falls into the class with impressions of touch, smell, taste, and so forth. Sound differs from them, however, in being fundamental to the things illustrated. Because the development of language has caused us to translate almost all our ideas into its terms, the illustrator must find some pictorial equivalent for word values.

The most usual difficulty that an illustrator encounters is, therefore, the substitution of visual for auditory images. The language of gesture, which he uses so generously scarcely goes further than the expression of interjections. Unless he uses the conventions of writing, most articulate speech is beyond him except in so far as he can bring it before us through association. With poetry the illustrator has frequently the advantage that some of the subject-matter is inarticulate (things expressed in life by gestures, facial expressions, and accompanying interjections, expressed in poetry directly by interjections, indirectly by description). The illustrator can translate this into visible form. But he has at the same time the more than compensating disadvantage that the music of the verse is wholly beyond him: he may substitute, however, a visual rhythm. With prose, though practically all the subject-matter is articulate, this disadvantage is not accompanied ordinarily (some

prose, like that of Baudelaire, may constitute an exception) by so great a loss in the sound value of the text.

These limitations of illustration do not by any means justify its condemnation. Every medium of expression has its limitations. The medium which is most adaptable of all (though it attains most of its ends indirectly), that of language, is often quite inadequate when it comes to expressing visual impressions. Further, it does not even attempt accurate expression of pain, for which it uses only a few generalized cries and groans. It falls back upon the indication of symptoms such as gesture and facial expression, the factors upon which illustration depends to make up its serious limitations in connection with sound. The illustrators of Dante found it possible to render the conversation of Dante and Virgil only very inaccurately, by gestures, and the sound of the horn blown by the giant we can only infer even from so able a drawing as that of Botticelli (Fig. 3); but the pain experienced by various characters the illustrators have given more fully and vividly (reverence for the poet and awareness that his purpose was not the expression of physical pain prevents us from saying *better*) than it is given in the poem. Witness the example by Blake (Fig. 4).

The illustration of Dante offers the very best material for the study of the particular problems of illustration. The hundreds of manuscripts and printed editions teem with material reflecting the progress of the art of illustration since the poet's day. The quantity of his verse and the variety of his matter are, moreover, so great that nearly every conceivable problem is presented to the illustrator. For Dante's poetry is very condensed, with rapid changes of subject-matter, continual allusions, swift presentment of the characteristic, often without environmental touches—all without sacrificing a peculiar unity, which depends less upon the outward form of the poem than upon the inner unity of the poet, the unity of his consciousness, not to say conscience, if, indeed, they be different.

This problem of unity is the crux of the situation. The unity of Dante and the unity of the illustrator do not readily coördinate. Dante's unity is a restriction in the number of

PLATE V



FIG. 4—ILLUSTRATION FOR INFERNO XXII, BY WILLIAM BLAKE



*Saccone nel calar n'è mai n'è mai
Sempre n'è sterno n'è mag-n'è sterno
che l'immagine loro n'è più n'è sangua
che l'male ond'io nel nolto n'è s'caro.*

FIG. 5—NAPLES, BIBLIOTECA NAZIONALE: CODEX XIII. C. 4, ILLUSTRATION FOR INFERNO XXX

characters elaborated in a canto. He does, indeed, observe the traditional literary unities of time, place, and action. These unities are not, however, such strait-jackets as they are supposed to be. They allow references to events outside the immediate course of the poem. The illustrator is, of course, bound to these technical unities as observed by Dante. Nay, more, not only does he observe them technically, but, in addition, his medium forbids the free use of running allusions and references, unless, indeed, he adopts some crude symbolism analogous to that by which the present theater attempts to render dreams. Dante's references are the result of the impossibility of representing things contemporaneously in any written or spoken account. His poetry is a time art and can only represent things in succession, not coexistent except in so far as they coexist in memory. On the other hand, the illustrator has no difficulty in representing coexistence, while to represent succession is very difficult for him. He can compass it only by adopting a characteristic of the time art, sequence. A single picture illustrating the Divine Comedy of Dante is unthinkable. When something approaching it has been tried, as in Orcagna's Inferno, we have in reality a sequence of pictures in a single frame. In fact, this is a failure in so far as the artist has tried to conceal that it is a sequence. A step forward towards solving the difficulty of Dante illustration is found in those attempts that offer an illustration for each canto of the Divine Comedy, though this rather mathematical scheme tends to provide too little illustration in many parts of the work (for example, in the Inferno), even leaving out of account any reference to the wealth of external allusions. On the other hand, in rejecting all these allusions the scheme tends to provide redundant illustrations in other parts (for example, in the Paradiso). A further attempt to devise illustration which does justice to the time element and to the real freedom which is possible to the poet while observing the technical unities is made by the use of a continuous method of narration. This is effectively employed by Botticelli. Only by the division into cantos (and in that he follows Dante fairly closely) does Botticelli break the continuity.

Even with this continuous method of narration, however, it is possible for Botticelli or any illustrator to follow only the main current of the poem and that but approximately. Dante ornaments his subject-matter with figures of speech. The visual arts also have their "figures of speech." But the two kinds do not correspond. Innumerable figures of speech which are, of course, fundamental to the poem have to be omitted from the illustration. As to the unity of the poet there is no precisely corresponding unity of the illustrator, so to the figures of speech of the poet there are no precisely corresponding "figures of speech" of the illustrator. Similes are to a poem what repetitions of patterns of line and spacing are to an illustration (or what variations on a theme are to a piece of music). With things so different in kind there can be no close correspondence. There is no valid reason why an illustrator should try to produce something for each figure of the poet. Only rarely can we tell whether he has done so or not. Seldom, indeed, will an illustrator have the hardihood to take care of the poet's figures by interpreting them literally, as has been done in the case of a fourteenth century representation of Master Adam, *fatto a guisa di liuto* (Fig. 5), and more seldom, if ever, will such an interpretation be successful.

If the illustrator has difficulty in rendering the occasional figures of speech, far less can he hope to present anything that will correspond to the allegory of the whole of a poetic cycle such as Dante's Divine Comedy. Even with the entire text of the poem before one, this allegory, it is only fair to say, is capable of varied interpretation, ethical and political. The illustrator can hardly be expected to give it any interpretation at all. In fact, by its very nature, illustration is not an art of interpretation, but rather an art of episodical description, a reinforcement of defective visibility in literature, a partial adjustment between the limitations of language and the magnitude of the imagination. "*L'imagination dispose de tout; elle fait la beauté, la justice, et le bonheur, qui est le tout du monde.*"—(Pascal)



PLATE VI



BALDWIN-WALLACE COLLEGE
PAGEANT: CIVIL WAR PERIOD



BALDWIN-WALLACE COLLEGE
PAGEANT: APOLLO AND THE MUSES

The Pageant in Colleges and Art Schools

By HOWARD FREMONT STRATTON

TO many students of our colleges, and, indeed, to a large part of the general public, college history is the record of games won on the athletic field. There are instances, to be sure, of notable discoveries in science made in these temples of learning and of archaeological finds by missions abroad. These light the columns of the newspapers with a meteoric splendor and as suddenly fade. Chronicles of endowments are likewise a flash in the editorial pan. Baseball, football, and their like are perpetually renewed, and the year is even divided into the seasons of these events. Of course, commencement day has its necessary place in the annual events, but only the events in sport are capitalized. And the student body migrates from city to city and from town to town to "make history" for the college by miniature warfare as nations essay to do in life-sized battles.

Meanwhile, just like the nation, the college is making another history, a history starting with the foundation of the institution, passing through its elemental struggles, perhaps with the growing pains of youth, and through the later manifold struggles for existence, for progress, and for attainment. This history is somehow not a part of the student's concern or of his own history. At least, he does not feel it as such. The more or less graphic accounts published in the circulars of the college constitute the record of history to be read, but they are only the letter and give little of the spirit. That the founders of the college suffered or struggled is simply the penalty of the pioneer, and it has been paid. If the work started with two students and now a multitude attends, what of it? None of this identifies the student who reads with the actual operation. His purpose is to get all that the college is equipped to give him, and not to equip the college. That he is a part, and the vital part, of its equipment does not strike him as a fact. How the

college has been equipped and even what that equipment stands for in the world of thought and education concern him not at all. All is ready-made for him and his use.

This loose attachment is the same as that which exists between citizen and nation until the citizen is brought face to face with a demonstration of the forces which combined to produce his nation. What our nation in its making suffered at Plymouth, at Valley Forge, at Andersonville became apparent to the present generation through the unrolling before its eyes of the awful drama of the world war.

Fortunately, so realistic a repetition of past events is not the only solution to our problem. A far more pleasant and hardly less appealing means of attaining a sympathetic appreciation of the sorrows and struggles, and likewise of the joys and triumphs, of our predecessors is through artistic repetition, through the pageant. Such a type of production, valuable for its own sake, for pure art, as well as for more didactic purposes, is particularly well adapted to small institutions such as schools and colleges.

Let us take as example a certain small town college in the Middle West. It has little outward appearance of interesting history. There are substantial buildings, a green and shady campus, a good library, the usual courses, and the usual teachers and students, surrounded by a quiet, easy-going town. But back of all this was the settlement here in 1844 by New England pioneers, who cleared the forest, made friends with the Indians, struggled with poverty, determined to have educational advantages for the small community, and finally by the discovery of emery stone deposits found the means to establish a college. Out of these and later events connected with the community and college, scenes were selected for a pageant which should present most vividly the life and ideals of the men and women of the past who made the present material and spiritual status of the place what it is. The natural ending of this enactment was the allegorical presentation of the academic subjects taught in the college, its outside activities and relations, and the great hope of its future.

PLATE VII



CLEVELAND SCHOOL OF ART PAGEANT: RENAISSANCE EPISODE



CLEVELAND SCHOOL OF ART PAGEANT: POMPEIIAN EPISODE

All these historical facts were, to be sure, already well known to members of the college and community, but they had never been real. The Alma Mater appeared to the students a comfortable, fairly benign personage, just as the home mother may seem; but the struggles she had undergone to be able to nourish and cherish these her children and to give standing to the community in which she held her seat had never been understood. The whole community came to see the visualization of the college history and hopes. And as the community found itself proud of its college, so the students, the alumni of long ago (this was the seventy-fifth anniversary) as well as the freshmen, met with the community on a common ground for the first time—and this also was history!

What this pageant at Baldwin-Wallace College did for specific historical events was done recently for the general æsthetic life of the past by a pageant at the Cleveland School of Art. This institution, for the first time in the history of art schools, eliminated this year the conventional "commencement," which has hitherto identified these occasions with the "closing exercises" of the most elementary institutions, and gave instead an art presentation, "Our Heritage of Beauty," a pageant typifying the gifts which the principal peoples of the earth have bestowed upon us who follow somewhat later than "the elder days of art."

Instructive is an unpopular word as applied to what one now goes to see. But to beauty there can be no valid objection (in spite of the cubists and other modernists). And if beauty gives us the truth about art, or shows us our indebtedness to the Orient, to Italy, to Greece, to whatever land gave us this beauty in art forms, we learn by seeing; and there is no better way to teach than by the pageant, which combines the arts. It is even more effective for this purpose than the play. The appeal of the Greek play, for example, especially in the original tongue, must necessarily be to the few; and of Shakespearian revivals the same may be said. This is nothing against them. The decline in the demand for the classic languages makes the great works written in them none the less great, only more of a sealed book to the onlookers. But the Greek athlete, the Greek

dancer, the Greek processional are as they ever were and ever shall be, immortal, immortal through their power to move the mind through the eye.

Byzantium, Persia are only names to the majority of Americans. Even art students know perhaps only the mosaics of the former and the miniatures of the latter. They are not living, and they have not lived; for us they are fixed on their walls and pages as they have been handed down, their life is frozen in these surface bonds. That the Byzantines and the Persians *had* life is only realized when motion is given to the dead forms in which that life is recorded. Theodora actually moving through her palace or "Thou" through her pleasance mean more than volumes of description; for the atmosphere proper to a fact (or to a fancy) is the only medium in which it can be kept alive. All great events, all great ideas require the sustenance of fitting background and atmosphere. If these can be created and the idea set in motion, it will live. If the idea is set in motion without its proper environment, it will not live.

In the Greek episode, for example, presented by the Cleveland pageant, the full sunlight falling upon the ivory, silver, and violet, and the red reflections on the poppy flame and gold of the costumes gave realism to the living being reanimated to personify this period. In the Gothic scene the sense of reality, of actual visualization of epoch and characters, was produced by so surrounding the actors that they moved in an atmosphere natural to the period. The illustration given here shows certain details which contributed toward this effect: the chest, the candlesticks, the tapestry, the illuminated volume, the fabrics of the costume, the wall hanging, the floor covering, and the selected personality of the performer. But the lighting peculiar to the mediæval interior in which the action took place cannot be shown in the reproduction, nor can we see the play of color incident to the passage of the richly attired characters. A purple and blue brocaded silk associated with orange velvet, coming into the varied rays from a stained glass window, brought before one very vividly the wondrous changes wrought by movement in the gray halls of the Middle Ages.

PLATE VIII



CLEVELAND SCHOOL OF ART PAGEANT: GOTHIC EPISODE



REVIEWS

POTS AND PANS, OR STUDIES IN STILL-LIFE PAINTING. BY ARTHUR EDWIN
BYE. 8°, 236 PP., 93 FIGS. PRINCETON, PRINCETON UNIVERSITY PRESS,
1921. \$6.00.

Dr. Bye, a painter of still-life himself, has given us under the simple but attractive title, *Pots and Pans*, a fascinating introduction to the study of still-life painting. He begins by granting us the case against still-life as being a minor branch of painting. This takes us off our guard immediately, and before he closes his first chapter, *The Historic Prejudice*, we are unwittingly convinced that still-life is not only a significant but also a most attractive branch of painting, the prejudice against which is the grossest philistinism. He is even able indirectly to accuse the late Kaiser of it.

The sporadic development of still-life during the Renaissance is lightly sketched in the second chapter. The author's style of writing is so iridescent in detail that one takes keen satisfaction in each episode as it appears. Then we come to the kernel of the book in the chapter on Dutch and Flemish still-life painting of the seventeenth century. This important movement is treated from the standpoint of subject. The names given to the different kinds of still-life pictures are very apt: pots and pans, trophies of the hunt, fruit and flowers, herring and wine. The last mentioned, a type of pictures favored particularly by the Haarlem painters of the seventeenth century, are breakfast pieces. But since the patent breakfast cereal has taken possession of the American imagination, the author has done well to go into details. After the discussion of Dutch and Flemish painting follows an interlude of a few pages in which four still-life painters of Spain are mentioned. Then the development of still-life in France from the eighteenth century to the present is traced. A chapter, based mainly on Fenollosa, is devoted to Chinese and Japanese still-life. The final two chapters are the most valuable and interesting in the book, dealing as they do with a subject peculiarly

familiar to Dr. Bye, the work of modern Dutch and American painters.

The book as a whole is not historical, in spite of its historical plan, but critical. The criticism, too, is quite unusual. The chief emphasis does not center upon discovering the antecedents of each painter's style nor upon describing the painter's reaction to his medium, although both of these things come out clearly. The fundamental point of approach is, rather, the analysis of the objects painted and the study of the extent to which each painter has mastered their characteristic qualities. Dr. Bye grows enthusiastic over the advantages of the still-life painter in dealing with his objects: "he can place them where he will, by the sunlit window, or in the shadowy corner of the room, *and there they have to stay*. No passing clouds will alter them, no new day will destroy their first effect; no varying moods can change their face. Only a few still-life subjects are deceptive like a summer day or a maiden's face; flowers will fade, and fish will decay; these are the exceptions we must have as with any rule." The book is characterized throughout by the great zest with which the author regards the objects to which the still-life painter gives his attention. "To catch," he writes, "the evanescence of poppies, the delicacy of roses or the subtlety of morning glories, the pure decorative quality of foxgloves, camellias or peonies is a pursuit worthy of every effort." The possibilities of fish evoke the following paragraph: "When one comes to think of it, fish are the most paintable objects in nature. Their fluid quality, their sliminess, their lustre, their brilliancy of color lend themselves most readily to the art of a painter in oils. Not that they are easy to paint—on the contrary, it requires the utmost dexterity of brushwork to obtain their fresh and shimmering sheen. And it cannot be done by prolonged, laborious work. A dead fish loses its fishiness on long acquaintance, while at the same time it gains other qualities we need not mention." This enthusiasm does not abandon the author when he turns from the objects to the pictures. But it does not imply uncritical praise or blame. The following excerpts from his appraisal of Fantin-Latour are typical: "No

matter how exciting the motley of red and pink and purple may appear, the surrounding grey gives rest. So that his vase of flowers is like a rich jewel against the velvet of a woman's dress, or a stained glass window within the gloom of a cathedral. The flowers are as vibrant sparkles of light out of the sombreness of a dull sky. This is the secret of Fantin-Latour, and this is why Geffroy could write, 'The smallest canvas of Fantin-Latour is a scheme where nothing is lacking to constitute a definite decoration.' . . . Decorative Fantin's still-lives may be, but in the sense that a bit of jewelry is decorative, and they remind one most of the mosaic brooches of the late Victorian age."

Pots and Pans is unlike the art literature which we are accustomed to see produced in America. It is not a biographical work written for reference, nor a book of attributions written for profit. It is meant to be read and it will be read by those who are fortunate enough to possess it. It represents a type of book common enough on the Continent, where the enjoyment of art is not confined to collectors. In particular, it is an enviable product of Professor Mather's influence at Princeton.

The author deserves congratulation for hitting upon such a virgin and fertile subject. As this is the first book in its field, it is not astonishing that there have been some considerable omissions. The exclusion of recent German still-life painting is unfortunate. Some mention might well have been made of the still-life painting of antiquity: we have ample evidence of its popularity, which continued into Early Christian times; in fact, among the most popular subjects were still-lives, the famous *asarota*. Still-life found its way into mediaeval illumination, and it is surprising that the influence of the manuscripts upon the Renaissance painters is not taken more into account by Dr. Bye. As he implies, another influence upon early still-life painting, that of sign painting, is now difficult for us to measure. It is tempting to venture the hypothesis, however, that our first Renaissance painter of full-fledged still-life, Jacopo de' Barbari, may have taken his departure from sign painting. For anyone who has travelled in the region between Nuremberg and Venice will remember that parts of it have still retained

the houses and customs of Jacopo's time and that luscious still-life sign boards are a striking local peculiarity.

These are but minor points. The essence of the matter is that we have in *Pots and Pans* a book of genuine, independent criticism. There is room on our library shelves for books of this kind on each of the branches of painting.

John Shapley

THE PRINCIPLES OF AESTHETICS. BY DEWITT H. PARKER. 8°, 374 PP.
BOSTON, SILVER, BURDETT & CO., 1920. \$2.50.

For general college use *The Principles of Aesthetics* by Parker is the most satisfactory English text-book on æsthetics so far produced. This judgment is pronounced not only with conviction but with gratitude, for the book fills a long felt need. In spite of serious and useful treatises on the subject—the learned, if intricate and difficult work of Bosanquet on the history of æsthetics, the brilliant, if one-sided, theories of Santayana, to mention only two examples—where was one to find a brief but comprehensive treatise which would embody what time and the continued studies of æstheticians have pronounced valuable in the theories of past and present, a treatise which would be, therefore, neither primarily historical nor primarily original, but which would give the consensus of modern thought in æsthetics? Perhaps the second volume of Knight's *Philosophy of the Beautiful* most nearly satisfied the need. But even here there is a tedious amount of historical material, and, particularly, the book is out of date; it does not take into account such important recent contributions as Croce's theory or the German theory of empathy. For the most part, our books in æsthetics stand in the same relation to college work as do most of those in the history of art: they are to be used as references rather than as texts.

Parker shows himself peculiarly well fitted for his task. A professor of philosophy, he is accustomed to logical and critical thinking. He is not merely inspired by some new, sensational theory, valuable as that might be in its way. To be sure, he does not lack original ideas, but they are the

fruit of the careful study and analysis of what has previously been done within the range of his subject. He does not hesitate to differ with his predecessors in the field, as when he points out the limitations of Croce's theories (pp. 16 and 21); nor does he hesitate—which is even greater credit to the scholar in this day of vaunted originality—to accept and make use of their theories, as he consciously or unconsciously does of Worringer's theory concerning the line (pp. 261 f.).

The general plan of the book is an investigation of æsthetics as a whole followed by an analysis and, incidentally, a comparison of the individual arts. The student is given a preliminary orientation by an explanation of the peculiarities of the methods required in the study of æsthetics. In this instance, as elsewhere, Parker cleverly makes use of the knowledge of science common to all modern students. In the very beginning the general prejudice in favor of the objective questions of science and the antipathy against the more subjective, personal questions of æsthetics are overcome. It is an interesting commentary upon the far-reaching influence of Croce's writings that such a treatment of æsthetics as Parker's, which one would describe as realistic, is yet colored at every turn by the theories of Croce, which may as truly be described as idealistic, based as the latter are upon the assumption that the object exists only as it is known (Croce, *Logica*, p. 120). Croce's definition of art as expression and intuition is adopted, but there are many divergencies in the interpretation of that definition. Two of these are particularly noteworthy. In the first place, Parker does not identify intuition (by which he means sympathetic insight) with expression but considers the former as the result of the latter (p. 38 ff.). In the second place, expression itself is given a different interpretation, or at least a different emphasis. For Croce the essential feature of expression lies in the mental activity; it makes no difference whether there is any embodiment in sensuous form. For Parker, on the other hand, the fundamental feature of expression is this very embodiment, "the putting forth of purpose, feeling, or thought into a sensuous medium, where they can

be experienced again by the one who expresses himself and communicated to others" (p. 16). "Self-expression that does not attain to objectivity is incomplete as art" (p. 42). In other words, while Croce distinguishes between art and what is commonly called the work of art (Croce, *Estetica*, ch. 15), Parker identifies the two.

After the development of the general æsthetic theory, Parker makes a concrete application of it in the study of the æsthetics of music, poetry, prose literature, painting, sculpture, and architecture. He begins with music because he believes that "there is a musical factor in all the arts" (p. 153). "Music," he writes, "is almost the sole important art that relies on the expressiveness of the sense material alone, independent of any element of meaning" (p. 160). Such expression produces an emotional response in the recipient which in its unmixed forms defies verbal expression. Apparently, it is this expressiveness of sense material that the author finds in some measure in all the arts, for it is explained early in the book that "we enter the æsthetic expression through the sensuous medium" (p. 28), and in the discussion of each of the arts the necessity, varying in importance, of the charm of the artist's medium is emphasized. The chapter on music is a good example of the thoroughness of Parker's studies of the various arts. Anything like a complete discussion of the technique of the arts would, of course, be out of place as well as impossible in such a book. Yet a brief outline of the technical construction, together with citations of detailed studies, is important for giving a solid framework on which to fasten the æsthetic interpretations.

The fact which "distinguishes music from all the other arts" is, according to Parker, that "it is characterized by the expression of emotion without the representation of the causes or objects of emotion" (p. 175). With poetry, which is classified as closely akin to music since "both are arts of sound and both employ rhythm as a principle of order in sound" (p. 188), we begin our departure from the realm of pure emotion into the realm of representation. Poetry supplies us with ideas; it "offers us concrete intuitions of life,—the rehearsal of emotions attached to real

things and clean-cut ideas" (p. 188). With painting and sculpture Parker takes us a step further, for they supply us, he says, with "definite images of nature" (p. 175). Our author makes it clear, however, that the value of painting and sculpture does not consist in imitation alone. He recognizes the joy we take in the colors, lines, and surfaces themselves. What he does not recognize is that the art of ornament, the most ancient and vital aspect of painting and sculpture, is not representative at all but is as abstract as music, along with which it should be placed. Moreover, in view of the modern development of the representative arts, especially that of painting, one feels that Parker has made the separation from music too rigid. The color nocturnes and symphonies of Whistler, the sparkling, scintillating canvases of Monet, are but slightly less pure expressions of emotion than is music. Even in the work of one of our most intellectual artists, Sargent, we may find a contradiction to Parker's contention that "with the static, concrete arts like painting and sculpture, it (music) will not fuse" (p. 181). No one who witnessed the recent unveiling of the Sargent decorations in the Boston Museum of Fine Arts could have failed to appreciate the enhancement lent both music and the two representative arts by their mutual accompaniment upon that occasion. There was plenty of allegorical and mythological significance in the painting and sculpture if one looked for it, but there was also so much of pure emotion in the flowing lines of the dancing figures, the rapid movements of centaur or satyr, and the bright, clear harmonies of colors that one felt much the same experience in following them as in listening to music. Parker's fundamental error in this matter grows out of his assumption that "the aesthetic experience of the picture is instantaneous and complete, while that of the music requires time for its development and fruition." "Hence," he says, "the two would soon fall apart, and a person would either have to ignore the music or cease to look at the picture" (p. 182).

The problem of beauty versus use is attacked in an interesting manner in the chapter on architecture. Aside from any beauty the industrial arts may have independently of their use, Parker emphasizes their beauty as expressed

in their usefulness: "And even if I do make use of the object, I may still get an aesthetic experience out of it, whenever I pause and survey it, delighting in it as an adequate expression of its purpose and my own joy in using it" (p. 299).

A book on aesthetics can hardly be considered complete without some discussion of the old problem of the relation of art to morality and religion, and this forms the subject of the last two chapters of our book. The puritan, the philistine, and the proletarian are allowed to present their charges against art as immoral, useless, and wasteful, and are given careful, well formulated answers. The chapter on art and religion is especially interesting, disclosing the parallel nature of the two: "The development of the relation of religion to life has been parallel to the development of art. Originally, religion penetrated every activity; now by contrast, it has been removed from one after another of the major human pursuits. . . . However, despite the separation of religion and art from life, they may continue to exert influence upon it. . . . In the case of both it consists in imparting to life a new meaning and perfection. . . . Art, the image of life, may now serve as a model, after which the latter, in its turn, will be patterned" (p. 350 ff.).

Although this review has emphasized the usefulness of Parker's treatise as a text-book, the volume is not to be thought of as a compilation of dry, factual material, a picture which, unfortunately, the word "text-book" calls up in the minds of many of us. What makes the present work appeal to us as peculiarly suitable for a text-book is its comprehensiveness, justness, balance, and clarity. There are none of the wearisome subdivisions, subheadings, or other earmarks of the confirmed text-book. The discussions are presented in a style that makes the reading attractive to anyone interested in the subject. Finally, even the few quotations given here are sufficient proof that the book is not lacking in original ideas nor in material for profitable discussion and controversy.

Fern Rusk Shapley

NOTES

ELEVENTH ANNUAL MEETING OF THE COLLEGE ART ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA

At the invitation of the School of Fine Arts of the University of Pennsylvania the committee on time and place has decided to hold the eleventh annual meeting of the College Art Association of America at Philadelphia on Thursday, Friday, and Saturday, April 13th, 14th, and 15th, 1922.

DUES OF ACTIVE MEMBERS

There was authorized at the tenth annual meeting in Washington, D. C., a poll of the membership of the College Art Association of America on the question of increasing active dues from three to five dollars a year. A two-thirds majority have favored the increase, which is hereby declared for the current year.